

**PART IV – REPRESENTATIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS**

**SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

M.01	PROPOSAL EVALUATION – GENERAL .....	M-2
M.02	BASIS FOR AWARD .....	M-3
M.03	OVERALL RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA.....	M-3
M.04	TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA .....	M-3
M.05	PRICE AND AWARD FEE EVALUATION CRITERION .....	M-6
M.06	FAR 52.217-5 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS (JULY 1990) .....	M-6

## **SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

### **M.01 PROPOSAL EVALUATION – GENERAL**

- (a) This acquisition will be conducted pursuant to the policies and procedures in FAR Part 15, and DEAR Part 915. DOE has established a Source Evaluation Board (SEB) to evaluate the proposals submitted for this acquisition. Proposals will be evaluated by the SEB members in accordance with the procedures contained in FAR Part 15, DEAR Part 915, and the Evaluation Factors hereinafter described. The Source Selection Official (SSO) will select an Offeror for contract award using the best value analysis described in this section.
- (b) The instructions set forth in Section L are designed to provide guidance to the Offeror concerning the documentation that will be evaluated by the SEB. The Offeror must furnish adequate and specific information in its proposal response. Cursory proposal responses that merely repeat or reformulate the Performance Work Statement are not acceptable. Further, a proposal will be eliminated from consideration before the evaluation if the proposal is so unacceptable on its face. For example, a proposal will be deemed unacceptable if it does not address itself to the essential requirements of the RFP, or if it clearly demonstrates that the Offeror does not understand the requirements of the RFP. In the event a proposal is rejected, a notice will be sent to the Offeror stating the reason(s) that the proposal will not be considered for further evaluation under this solicitation.
- (c) The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions or exchanges with Offerors (except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)). If a competitive range is established pursuant to FAR 15.306(c), Offerors are hereby advised that only the most highly rated proposals deemed to have a reasonable chance for award of a contract may be included in the competitive range. Offerors that are not included in the competitive range will be promptly notified. Therefore, the Offeror's proposal shall contain the Offeror's best terms from a cost or price and technical standpoint. The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer later determines them to be necessary.
- (d) Prior to award, a determination will be made regarding whether any potential Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI) exist with respect to the apparent successful Offeror. In making this determination, the Contracting Officer (CO) will consider the representation required by Section K of this solicitation. An award will be made if any potential OCI can be appropriately avoided, neutralized, or mitigated.
- (e) Any exceptions or deviations by the Offeror to the terms and conditions stated in this solicitation for inclusion in the resulting contract may make the offer unacceptable for award without discussions. If an Offeror proposes exceptions to the terms and conditions of the contract, the Government may make an award without discussions to another Offeror that did not take exception to the terms and conditions of the contract.

## **M.02 BASIS FOR AWARD**

- (a) DOE intends to award one contract to the responsible Offeror whose proposal is responsive to the solicitation and determined to be the best value to the Government. Selection will be achieved through a process of evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of each Offeror's proposal against the evaluation criteria described below.

In determining best value to the government, the Technical Evaluation Criteria are significantly more important, when combined, than the evaluated price. The Government is more concerned with obtaining a superior technical proposal than making an award at the lowest evaluated price. Thus, the closer or more similar in merit that the Offerors' technical proposals are evaluated to be, the more likely the evaluated price may be the determining factor in selection for award. However, the Government will not make an award at a price premium it considers disproportionate to the benefits associated with the evaluated superiority of one technical proposal over another. Evaluated price will not be adjectively rated. In determining the best value, the Government will assess whether the strengths and weaknesses between or among competing technical proposals indicate a superiority from the standpoint of:

- (1) What the difference might mean in terms of anticipated performance; and
  - (2) What the evaluated price to the Government would be to take advantage of the difference.
- (b) It is DOE's intent to award the contract to the Offeror whose proposal represents the best value to the Government.

## **M.03 OVERALL RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Proposals will be evaluated on the technical evaluation criteria below::

1. Technical and Management Approach
2. Past Performance
3. Key Personnel and Organizational Structure
4. Relevant Experience

Criterion 1 and Criterion 2 are equal in importance and, when combined, are significantly more important than Criterion 3 and Criterion 4, which are also equal in importance. Areas within an evaluation criterion are not sub-criteria and will not be individually rated, but will be considered in the overall evaluation for that particular evaluation criterion.

## **M.04 TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA**

### **Criterion 1: Technical and Management Approach**

DOE will evaluate the following:

The Offeror's technical approach to demonstrate its understanding of and ability to perform the requirements of the Performance Work Statement.

The Offeror's technical approach to maintaining quality laboratory results, improving laboratory operations, reducing turn-around time on analyses, and reducing costs including:

- Any proposed technical innovations that will enhance laboratory operations to meet the needs of customers.
- Proposed approach to achieving high proficiency of analytical services.
- Any approach by the Offeror that will reduce life cycles costs for laboratory operations.

The Offeror's management approach to the variability in workload, including full-time staffing levels, work surge, and activities performed when not processing samples, such as required training and maintaining equipment.

The Offeror's staffing plan that: 1) demonstrates the ability to obtain, retain, and maintain the breadth and depth of qualified staff and 2) its proposed approach to pensions and benefits necessary to perform the required services described in the PWS.

The Offeror's management approach to demonstrate their understanding of and approach to the following activities:

- Implementing laboratory and customer requirements
- Managing interfaces with customers, service providers, and Hanford-wide programs  
Providing integrated safety management, an effective safety culture, quality assurance and quality control

The Offeror's proposed approach to transition activities as part of the Management Approach including; the process and planned activities for conducting a safe, orderly transition; minimizing impacts on continuity of operations; identifying key issues, that may arise during transition, and resolutions; the approach to overcoming barriers; and planned interactions with DOE, the incumbent Contractor, incumbent employees, and other site Contractors. DOE will also evaluate the proposed implementation schedule, identified milestones, and measurable commitments to determine whether the proposed approach is comprehensive and effective.

## **Criterion 2: Past Performance**

DOE will evaluate the past performance of the Offeror, including any entity comprising the teaming arrangement thereof as defined by FAR 9.601, and major subcontractor(s) for contracts, task orders, or projects currently on-going or completed within the last three (3) years and that encompasses work similar in size and scope to the PWS.

- **Size** is defined as dollar value and duration

- **Scope** is defined as the type of work including complexity (e.g. performance challenges)

DOE will consider past performance information submitted by the Offeror on the Attachment L-3, Past Performance & Relevant Experience Reference Information Form, information submitted by the Offeror's references on Attachment L-4, Past Performance Questionnaire (where applicable for non-DOE Office of Environmental Management work or where a PPIRS record is not available), and any other information obtained through the available Federal Government electronic databases, readily available Government records, and sources other than those identified by the Contractor. Contract references, including those identified by the Offeror on Attachment L-3 and Attachment L-4 and those not identified by the Offeror, but listed in E-government databases, may be contacted for information to be used in past performance evaluation.

The higher the degree of relevance of the work described to the PWS, the greater the consideration that may be given. Additionally, more recent relevant past performance information may also be given greater consideration. Any work performed for DOE's Office of Environmental Management will be considered at least Somewhat Relevant. In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance, or for whom information on relevant past performance is not available, the Offeror will be evaluated neither favorably nor unfavorably.

### **Criterion 3: Key Personnel and Organizational Structure**

- (a) DOE will evaluate the key personnel proposed by the Offeror for the positions of Laboratory Manager and any other key personnel positions as designated by the Offeror in the following areas:
1. The relevancy of their education, leadership, relevant experience, suitability to the proposed position, and experience on work similar to that described in the Performance Work Statement based on resume reviews.
  2. How the proposed key personnel's work experience relates to Hanford 222-S Laboratory environment and capability to function effectively in the proposed position.
  3. The designation of key positions relative to the approach to the management and execution of the PWS proposed by the Offeror.

Failure to submit letters of commitment and to use the resume format identified in Attachment L-1 may result in the Offeror receiving a lower rating for this factor.

- (b) DOE will evaluate the Offeror's proposal based on the rationale for the chosen organizational structure, efficiency, and effectiveness of its proposed organization, including the benefits of its use of subcontracting or teaming arrangements (if any), as defined by FAR 9.601, to meet the government's requirements and accomplish the PWS.

**Criterion 4: Relevant Experience**

DOE will evaluate the Offeror's relevant experience in performing work similar in size and scope to the PWS. DOE will evaluate the relevant experience of the Offeror, including any entity comprising the teaming arrangement thereof, as defined by FAR 9.601, and the Offeror's major subcontractor(s) for the same contracts, task orders, or projects referenced for past performance information on Attachment L-3, Past Performance and Relevant Experience Reference Information Form. DOE will evaluate the demonstrated relevancy of the work performed to the PWS requirements including any improvements implemented in the performance of the work.

**M.05 PRICE AND AWARD FEE EVALUATION CRITERION**

The Offeror's price proposal will not be point scored or adjectivally rated, but will be evaluated for completeness and price reasonableness to determine whether the proposed price reflects an understanding of the RFP requirements.. The price evaluation will be based upon the Offeror's "Total Proposed Contract Price" which will be calculated using the arithmetic sum of the prices for Transition; Laboratory Services, both fixed price and labor-hour; and award fee in Section B.02, inclusive of option periods.

The Government also may use any or all of the price analysis techniques and procedures described in FAR 15.404-1(b) to determine price reasonableness. The price analysis will be utilized to determine if the proposed firm fixed unit prices/rates and total proposed price are reasonable and consistent with the Technical Proposal with regard to the nature and scope of the work to be performed.

An unreasonable or incomplete Price Proposal may be evidence of the Offeror's lack of, or poor understanding of, the requirements of the PWS and thus may adversely affect the rating of the Offeror's Technical Proposal.

**M.06 FAR 52.217-5 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS (JULY 1990)**

Except when it is determined in accordance with FAR 17.206(b) not to be in the Government's best interests, the Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).